

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 3 and 12-22. These sheets, which include Figs. 3 and 12-22, replace the original sheets illustrating Figs. 3 and 12-22.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of February 16, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 6-8, 10 and 13-22 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-22 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested in view of the following arguments.

Specification

Applicants have amended the specification to clarify the use of trademarks Excel and Access.

Drawings

Applicants have submitted replacement sheets including Figs. 3 and 12-22. As such, the objection to the drawings is respectfully traversed.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action indicates that claims 13 and 14 contain trademarks/trade names. Applicants have amended claims 13 and 14 to remove the reference to trademarks and/or trade names. As such, amended claims 13 and 14 are allowable over this rejection.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-11, 13-15 and 19-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Woo *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,910,017, hereinafter “Woo”). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claims 1, 21 and 22 all relate to, *inter alia*, verifying the integrity of the one or more text files based on validating the archived sales data. Woo lacks any teaching or suggestion of such a feature. The Office Action asserts, at p. 7, that Woo discloses validating the archived sales data to insure integrity of retrieved files at col. 8, lines 39-49. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited passage discloses modifying a model equation as new actual

data on sales becomes available. Col. 8, ll. 39-49. The model equation is used to predict future gross profit based on aggregated historical information. Col. 5, ll. 34-64. At most, Woo discloses revising or updating a model equation based on new actual data on sales, not validating *archived sales data*. Not only does Woo lack any teaching or suggestion of validating archived sales data, Woo also fails to teach or suggest verifying the integrity of text files based on such a validation. As such, claims 1, 21 and 22 are allowable for at least this reason.

Claims 2-11, 13-15, 19 and 20 are dependent on claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein. For example, claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein the step of validating the archived sales data includes identifying one or more items of the archived sales data with a stock keeping unit (SKU) code of zero.” Nowhere does Woo teach or suggest such a feature. While Woo discloses, at col. 3 line 65 – col. 4 line 57, aggregating historical data into classes and subclasses based on information such as SKUs, Woo lacks any teaching or suggestion of identifying items of the archived sales data with a SKU code of zero. As such, claim 15 is allowable for this additional reason.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 12 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Woo as applied to claims 11 and 15. The Office Action allegedly cures the deficiencies of claims 12 and 16-18 based on the Examiner’s Official Notice. Even so, the Examiner’s Official Notice does not cure the above-identified deficiencies of Woo with respect to claim 1, from which claims 12 and 16-18 depend. As such, claims 12 and 16-18 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 16th day of May, 2006

By:



Chunhsia Andy Mu, Registration No. 58,216

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001